

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/551,279

Applicant(s)

TATEBE ET AL.

Examiner

DEAN KWAK

Art Unit

1797

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DEAN KWAK.

(3) Peter DeVore

(2) TONY SOOHOO.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 19 June 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed: JP-2001-165930

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant discussed [0066] and pointed to the prior art bonded layers in contrast to the instant "single membrane". It is the office's position that the JP ref. shows a single final membrane product. Regarding [0066], the examiner suggested method of making claims may bring out the layer distinction between the instant invention and the JP ref.

TONY G. SOOHOO

PRIMARY EXAMINER 1792